ATTACHMENT R-3 WELLFIELD CLOSURE COSTS

Contents

| Executive Summary | i |
|-------------------------------------|----|
| Closure Plan for the ISR Wellfield | |
| ISR Wellfield Closure Liability | 2 |
| Closure Cost Estimation for Bonding | |
| Work Plans and Mobilization | |
| Labor Costs | 4 |
| Pump Replacement Costs | 4 |
| Quarterly Reporting | 5 |
| Power Costs | 5 |
| Wellfield Rinsing Credits | 8 |
| Rinsing Verification Sampling | 9 |
| Well Abandonment Costs | 10 |
| Post-Closure Monitoring | 12 |
| Cumulative Closure Liability | 13 |

Tables

- Table R3-1: Closure Costs and Closure Credits by Year
- Table R3-2: Labor Hourly Costs
- Table R3-3: Power Cost for Fresh Water Supply Pumping for Rinsing
- Table R3-4: Power Cost for Rinse Recovery Well Pumping
- Table R3-5: Power Cost for Hydraulic Control Well Pumping
- Table R3-6: Power Cost for Mechanical Evaporation
- Table R3-7: Wellfield Rinsing Credits by Year
- Table R3-8: Worksheet used to Calculate Rinsing Verification Unit Costs
- Table R3-9: Year-By-Year Well Abandonment Cost Summary
- Table R3-10: Cost for Five Years of Post-Closure Monitoring
- Table R3-11: Closure Cost Detail
- Table R3-12: Well Abandonment Cost Detail

Executive Summary

A closure strategy and cost estimate for the Stage 1 Gunnison ISR wellfield has been developed in accordance with ADEQ, ADWR, EPA UIC, and BADCT guidelines. The closure activities will include ISR wellfield rinsing, pullback pumping, rinsing verification monitoring, well abandonment, and post-closure monitoring.

An Aquifer Protection Permit (APP) from ADEQ will be required in addition to the Underground Injection Control (UIC) permit from the EPA. Separate bonds will be held for closure costs associated with the APP and the UIC. The APP bond will consist of pond closure and POC well abandonment costs. The UIC bond will consist of all other costs including rinsing, well abandonment (excluding POCs) pullback pumping, work plans, mobilization, reporting and post closure monitoring.

The closure cost details presented in this attachment are the same as those provided to ADEQ for the APP except for the ponds and the abandonment of the POC wells which have been excluded.

The most extensive closure activity will be the rinsing of the wellfield that will require flushing the leached formations with clean water, the extraction of the impacted rinse water, and evaporating it in the Gunnison Evaporation Pond #1. Costs have been developed for general administration, wellfield labor and maintenance, power for wellfield pumps needed for rinsing, mechanical evaporators, rinsing verification monitoring, and post-closure monitoring.

Well abandonment will be conducted according to ADWR guidelines by removing the wellhead piping and pumps followed by grouting the boreholes in accordance with EPA UIC requirements. Wells scheduled for abandonment include injection and recovery wells, hydraulic control wells, observation wells, intermediate monitor wells (IMWs), rinse verification wells, and Point-of-Compliance (POC) wells. Costs for abandonment were developed using third party contractor costs and include labor and supervision, pre-grouting activities, grouting, perforation (where applicable), casing removal to two feet below the surface, and debris removal.

The costs for ISR wellfield closure by each year are presented in Table R3-1 for the ten years covering Stage 1 production. Credits have also been tabulated for the cost of closure activities that will have been completed by a given year. From the table, the maximum liability (\$8.47 million) occurs in Year 10. The closure costs will be re-evaluated in Year 6. From Table R-1, the difference in cost between Year 10 and Year 6 is approximately \$700,000 that can be used as a contingency for additional pullback pumping if required in Years 1 through 6.

Table R3-1: Summary of Closure Costs and Closure Credits by Year (\$Millions)

| | Ta | ble: Summ | ary of Closi | ure Costs a | nd Closure | Credits by | Year (\$Milli | ons) | | |
|-------------------------|-------------------|---------------|--------------|-------------|------------|------------|---------------|--------|--------|--------|
| Item | Y1 | Y2 | Y3 | Y4 | Y5 | Y6 | Y7 | Y8 | Y9 | Y10 |
| Rinsing | 1.708 | 2.175 | 2.623 | 3.013 | 3.041 | 3.159 | 3.039 | 3.091 | 2.962 | 2.993 |
| Well Abandonment | 1.091 | 1.496 | 1.754 | 2.150 | 2.518 | 2.878 | 3.499 | 3.554 | 3.556 | 3.626 |
| Other** | 0.336 | 0.340 | 0.343 | 0.345 | 0.345 | 0.346 | 0.345 | 0.345 | 0.345 | 0.345 |
| Pullback Pumping | 1.850 | 1.539 | 1.254 | 0.995 | 0.902 | 0.834 | 0.897 | 0.865 | 0.933 | 0.923 |
| Contingency (10%) | 0.499 | 0.555 | 0.597 | 0.650 | 0.681 | 0.722 | 0.778 | 0.785 | 0.779 | 0.789 |
| Total (no credit) | 5.484 | 6.104 | 6.571 | 7.153 | 7.486 | 7.939 | 8.558 | 8.640 | 8.574 | 8.676 |
| Credit | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | -0.132 | -0.085 | -0.164 | -0.123 | -0.136 | -0.120 |
| Total with credit | 5.484 | 6.104 | 6.571 | 7.153 | 7.353 | 7.854 | 8.394 | 8.517 | 8.439 | 8.556 |
| **Costs for work plans, | , mobilization, r | eporting, and | post closure | monitoring | | | | | | |

Closure Plan for the ISR Wellfield

Closure of the ISR wellfield will consist of rinsing and neutralization of the portions of the formation that have been exposed to leach solution. The wells will be closed and abandoned in accordance with UIC regulations and Arizona Department of Water Resources (ADWR) guidance after rinsing has reduced all constituents to primary MCLs and Arizona Aquifer Water Quality Standards (AWQSs).

Metallurgical test results and geochemical modeling indicate that neutralization and constituent concentration reduction to appropriate levels can be accomplished by a three-step process (as described in Attachment H-2). First, the acidified leaching solution is replaced with clean water to dilute the concentration of leach solution in the formation to approximately 5 percent (Attachment H-3). Second, active circulation of solutions within the subject portion of the wellfield is suspended for approximately 200 days to neutralize the acid. Geochemical modeling based on mineralogy indicates that the leached formation will have sufficient acid neutralizing potential to raise the pH to near neutral. The third step is additional flushing with clean water to reduce regulated constituents to acceptable concentrations. The first rinsing step will require three pore volumes and the second rinse (third step) will require two pore volumes (Attachment H-2). AWQSs and primary MCLs are expected to be met after the rest period (except for a possible minor exceedance of the fluoride AWQS/MCL); the two additional pore volumes are a contingency to provide extra confidence in the expected results.

Clean water for rinsing during Stage 1 production will be provided by water supply wells and unimpacted hydraulic control water. Water for rinsing Stage 2 and Stage 3 wells is anticipated to also include recycled water from a water treatment plant constructed in later stages. For Stage 1, rinse water will directly flow by gravity from the Fresh Water Tank on the Johnson Camp Mine property. In Stages 2 and 3, water for rinsing will be pumped from the Clean Water Pond. Rinse water will be injected into the production wellfield. Extracted water will be pumped to the Evaporation Pond for natural and mechanical evaporation. The "first flush", which can be considered the first pore volume, from Step 1 rinsing will contain sufficient copper grade for economical extraction in the SX-EW plant. After the copper concentration drops below the economic threshold, the remainder of rinsate extracted will be sent to the Evaporation Pond.

Rinsing is considered complete when the concentrations of all constituents are at or below AWQSs and primary MCLs. Wells that are accepted as being sufficiently rinsed¹ will be abandoned in accordance with EPA and ADWR criteria. The wells will be grouted from bottom upward using a tremie pipe to eliminate its ability to act as a conduit for solution migration.

¹ With the exception of wells that will be used as Rinse Verification and Closure Verification wells. These will be left open for monitoring and abandoned later according to the closure strategy.

ISR Wellfield Closure Liability

When wells are added and put into production, they are assumed to accrue a liability for the complete three step rinsing, as described above. This liability includes all the components of rinsing, verification, and abandonment. This liability continues to grow until rinsing begins. As the rinsing and closure of wells progresses, the liability is reduced in the year that operations are completed in the form of rinsing credits and the removal of wells from the number that need to be abandoned for the subject year. For example, if 183 wells are present at the beginning of the year, 16 are closed (abandoned), and 14 are added, the year-end liability for well abandonment is 181.

The process of rinsing the production wellfield is expected to take approximately two years, since the time duration is dominated by the need to "rest" the wells in order to neutralize the solution. If there are 40 cells (five spot patterns) that need to be rinsed, the first 20 are rinsed for approximately 200 days to achieve three pore volumes of rinsing. The first 20 cells are put into "resting mode" while the second group of 20 cells is rinsed with three pore volumes. The second group is rested while the first group is rinsed with the final two pore volumes for approximately 130 days. After 70 more days of "resting," the second group of wells is rinsed for the final 130 days with an elapsed time of 730 days or 2 years. The volume of cumulative rinsing liability (in gallons) is divided by 576,000 gallons (400 gpm x 60 min x 24 hrs) to approximate the time (in days) for rinsing all of the wells. An additional 10% is added to the time to account for overlaps and inefficiencies in moving from one group of cells to the next.

Costs to complete the wellfield closure and abandonment process have been estimated for each year of Stage 1. Closure of the spent portions of the wellfield is planned to take place throughout the life of the operation beginning in Year 5 when rinsing will begin of the first wells that are anticipated to produce copper concentrations that fall below economic cutoff. These costs are based on evaluating the annual closure liability for each year of Stage 1 operation if the project were to shut down.

Pullback Pumping

Pullback pumping costs are included in the closure costs to allow for the capture of potential solution excursions from the active mining blocks. The pullback pumping will draw down the water table and "pull back" solutions into the mining area. The pullback pumping will be conducted in conjunction with rinsing of the wellfield.

In the model simulations, particles initially migrate away from mining blocks during operations but then the paths are reversed and particles are captured when recovery or pullback pumping operations begin after a mining year. The modeling shows that all particles are captured within 3 years after pullback pumping starts, with most being captured within one year of pullback pumping. Model simulations were made to evaluate capture in Years 1 and 5 and used to estimate the costs for pullback pumping for all of Stage 1. Excelsior does not believe modeling closure scenarios after year 5 is necessary given that Excelsior will be reviewing the model performance as compared to actual operations as part of the planned review of closure cost bonding after year 6. Modeling at that time will incorporate updates based on operations and monitoring data.

The assumptions used for the pullback pumping simulations are conservative because normal mine operations will create a "sweep" effect outside the perimeter of a mining block specifically to recapture mining solutions as part of the normal recovery operations (i.e. without pullback pumping). Also, no control strategies are simulated, such as local over-pumping to control detected excursions. Pullback pumping will draw in clean water which will naturally rinse the mining area.

It was assumed that after Year 1 and Year 5 of mining, recovery wells around the perimeter of the blocks would be operated to pull back any potential solutions as represented by particles in the model. For the Year 5 scenario, the two hydraulic control (HC) wells along the southern boundary of the wellfield also need to be operated.

Costs for the pullback pumping have been estimated for each year of Stage 1. The additional labor and power costs for pullback pumping have been included with the closure costs.

Closure Cost Estimation for Bonding

The following sections provide details on the various cost categories shown in **Table R3-11**.

Work Plans and Mobilization

In the event that the operators of the project default on their obligations under the permit, it is assumed that the EPA and/or the State of Arizona would have the responsibility of completing closure and post-closure operations. The State would likely hire a remediation contractor to conduct the necessary closure and post-closure operations, using subcontractors where necessary to perform such services as rinsing, well abandonment, and pump replacement. It is also assumed that the contractor would have to prepare work plans, assemble a team and mobilize to the site to begin rinsing and closure operations. A lump sum estimate of \$75,000 has been allocated for the

preparation of work plans. An additional \$20,000 has been allocated for mobilization and demobilization from the site.

Labor Costs

The process of rinsing the production wellfield and the pullback pumping is estimated to take three years. The rinsing is rested for a year to naturally neutralize the solution and the pullback pumping occurs throughout the three years. Therefore, three years of wellfield operation, maintenance, and general and administrative costs are included in the closure costs regardless of the mining year in Stage 1 that the mining operations cease.

The operation of the wellfield can be managed by a supervisor, two operators, an electrician and site security personnel during the rinsing and pullback pumping cycle. Hourly rates for wellfield rinsing staff are shown in Table R3-2 and unit costs are shown in Table R3-11 on Lines 58-62.

Table R3-2: Labor Hourly Costs

| Position | Quantity | Hourly Rate |
|-----------------------|----------|-------------|
| Project Manager | 1 | \$125 |
| Rinsing Supervisor | 1 | \$72 |
| Wellfield Operator | 2 | \$56 |
| Wellfield Electrician | 1 | \$44 |
| Site Security | 1 | \$30 |
| Overhead | 10% | |

Hourly rates were obtained by using R.S. Means conversions of local, published salaries for specific positions. Labor costs were developed by taking the rinsing duration in days and dividing them by 7 to determine number of weeks. The project manager was assigned 10 hours per week while the field personnel were assigned 40 hours per week and site security 60 hours per week. An overhead charge of 10% was applied to all labor rates to cover such things as vehicle use and administrative and field expenses.

Pump Replacement Costs

Before rinsing can begin, submersible pumps in the recovery wells need to be changed for similar pumps with a smaller discharge rate. Rinsing operations are limited by the supply of fresh water available at the Johnson Camp Mine (approximately 400 gpm), so it is impractical to rinse the wellfield at production-level injection rates. A subcontractor with well maintenance experience will be used to change the pumps.

During production, the recovery wells will typically be sized to pump approximately 80 gpm. During rinsing, the recovery pumping rates for rinsate will be typically 25% of that rate, or 20 gpm, requiring a change in the pumps to operate efficiently. Costs for pump replacement and well maintenance have been estimated on a contract basis using a quote from Verdad, Inc. in Tucson. The cost for a replacement pump for 20 gpm recovery is estimated at \$2,990. Labor, rig costs, and per diem are estimated at 4 hours per well for rig and labor costs, and ½ day of per diem per well. A single mobilization charge of \$1,500 is estimated for pump replacement. It was assumed that a new submersible well pump would be capable of recovering rinsate for the estimated 330 days of pumping required without significant maintenance costs.

Quarterly Reporting

As mentioned above, in the event that the operators of the project default on their obligations under the permit, it is assumed that the EPA and/or the State of Arizona would have the responsibility of completing closure and post-closure operations for purposes of calculating the closure bond. The remediation contractor will prepare quarterly reports. In any given year, the number of reports that it will take to complete rinsing will vary, depending on how many cells must be rinsed. For example, in Year 4, the duration of rinsing needed for existing wells is 676 days (Line 5 of Table R3-1) so there will be 8 quarterly reports prepared (Line 22).

Power Costs

The primary cost of rinsing is power. Power costs are based on the cost of power (\$0.08/kWh) from Sulphur Springs Valley Electric Co-operative to the Johnson Camp Mine during recent operation before the mine went into care and maintenance. Unit power costs (\$/Mgal) are discussed below for the following:

- Water Supply Pumping for Rinsing
- Rinse Recovery Pumping
- Hydraulic control Pumping
- Mechanical Evaporation

Water supply costs for rinsing are based on the existing wells at the Johnson Camp Mine and the estimated power cost to pump 400 gallons per minute (gpm) divided by the flow rate requirement to accomplish the rinsing. Water supply is provided by two 60 hp pumps capable of producing 400 gpm. The cost per gallon of water supply for rinsing is \$0.0002685, or \$268.45 per million gallons (/Mgal) as shown in Table R3-3.

Table R3-3: Power Cost for Fresh Water Supply Pumping for Rinsing

| Description | Units | Quantity |
|--------------------------|---------|-----------|
| Water Supply output | gpm | 400 |
| Conversion | gph | 24,000 |
| Water Supply Pump motors | hp | 120 |
| Conversion | kW/hp | 0.746 |
| Power Factor | % | 90 |
| Power usage | kW | 80.5 |
| Cost per kW-hr | \$ | 0.080 |
| Pumping Cost per hour | \$ | 6.44 |
| Water Supply Power Cost | \$/gal | 0.0002685 |
| Water Supply Power Cost | \$/Mgal | \$268.45 |

Rinsate from the recovery wells is pumped up to the Gunnison Evaporation Pond. Maintenance for these pumps is included in wellfield maintenance. The rinse recovery pumping liability assumes a 5 hp motor capable of pumping 15 gpm per well against a total dynamic head of over 600 feet with a power cost of \$0.08 per kilowatt-hour (kW-hr) to extract rinse water. The cost per gallon of rinse recovery pumping is \$0.0002983, or \$298.28/Mgal as shown in Table R3-4.

Table R3-4: Power Cost for Rinse Recovery Well Pumping

| Description | Units | Quantity |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------|
| Rinse Recovery Pumping | gpm | 15 |
| Conversion | gph | 900 |
| Recovery Pump motors | hp | 5 |
| Conversion | kW/hp | 0.746 |
| Power Factor | % | 90 |
| Power usage | kW | 3.4 |
| Cost per kW-hr | \$ | 0.080 |
| Pumping Cost per hour | \$ | 0.27 |
| Rinse Recovery Pumping Cost | \$/gal | 0.0002983 |
| Rinse Recovery Pumping Cost | \$/Mgal | \$298.28 |

Hydraulic control wells are outfitted with 5 HP pumps. These pumps must be utilized throughout the rinsing process to ensure that hydraulic control is maintained to prevent excursions of impacted rinse solutions until the formations are adequately rinsed. Table R3-5 summarizes the power consumption and cost of power for hydraulic control wells during closure.

Table R3-5: Power Cost for Hydraulic Control Well Pumping

| Description | Units | Quantity |
|-----------------------------------|---------|-----------|
| Hydraulic Control Pumping | gpm | 15 |
| Conversion | gph | 900 |
| Recovery Pump motors | hp | 5 |
| Conversion | kW/hp | 0.746 |
| Power Factor | % | 90 |
| Power usage | kW | 3.4 |
| Cost per kW-hr | \$ | 0.080 |
| Pumping Cost per hour | \$ | 0.27 |
| Hydraulic Control Pumping Cost | \$/gal | 0.0002983 |
| Hydraulic Control Pumping Cost | \$/Mgal | \$298.28 |

Power costs for mechanical evaporation of the rinsate are based on vendor information using climatic data for the Johnson Camp mine. The annual average evaporation required is 37.6 million gallons. The evaporator model that has been selected for purposes of this estimate is the Mega Polecat model from SMI Evaporative Systems. One operating evaporator and one standby evaporator are needed in Years 1 and 2. The number of evaporators reaches a maximum seven operating and one standby in Year 7. However, in full-scale rinsing during closure the available rinse water flow heading to evaporation will be 440 gpm, requiring 11 evaporators total. The capital cost for adding 9 evaporators (11 total) at \$91,000 per evaporator (with controls, based on a quote from SMI Evaporative Solutions) is held constant throughout the closure cost estimate to provide for the additional units required during closure.

The capacity of one evaporator is 130 gpm with an average evaporation efficiency calculated from manufacturer's data of 55% for an evaporation rate of 71.5 gpm, or 4,290 gallons per hour. The fan motor and pump to supply water to the unit total 90 hp. The unit rate for evaporation is \$0.001129 per gallon, or \$1,126.83 per million gallons as shown in Table R3-6.

Table R3-6: Power Cost for Mechanical Evaporation

| Description | Units | Quantity |
|--------------------------------|---------|------------|
| Evaporation Rate | gpm | 71.5 |
| Conversion | gph | 4,290 |
| Fan Pump | hp | 60 |
| Feed Pump | hp | 30 |
| Conversion | kW/hp | 0.746 |
| Power Factor | % | 90 |
| Power usage (fan+pump) | kW | 60.4 |
| Cost per kW-hr | \$ | 0.080 |
| Evaporator Power Cost per hour | \$/hr | 4.83 |
| Evaporation Power Cost | \$/gal | 0.0011268 |
| Evaporation Power Cost | \$/Mgal | \$1,126.83 |

Wellfield Rinsing Credits

The process of closing production wells is scheduled to begin in Year 5 of production. The first step in well closure is early rinsing in which the leach solution is replaced with clean water to dilute the pore water in the formation approximately 95 percent. Geochemical studies (Attachment H-2) indicate that this will require injection of approximately three pore volumes of clean water. Once complete, the closure liability is reduced by the cost of that rinsing and is shown as a credit (Line 103 of Table R3-11 and Table R3-7). The early rinsing credit is calculated as three-fifths of the rinsing liability, since it takes three of the five pore volumes necessary to complete the rinsing.

The second step of rinsing involves shutting down the wellfield for approximately 200 days. Rinse water injection and rinsate recovery is stopped to allow the remaining solution to be neutralized by the formation. The natural acid neutralizing potential of the formation has been shown by metallurgical test work to bring the rinse water resting in the formation to near neutral pH in approximately 200 days. After the rest phase, the geochemical model indicates that only fluoride will exceed the AWQS/primary MCL.

Additional rinsing is conducted in step three to flush out constituents remaining in the formation after neutralization. Geochemical modeling indicates that an additional two pore volumes of rinse water needs to be injected and recovered to reduce all constituents (specifically fluoride—all others are expected to meet AWQSs and primary MCLs at the end of the rest phase) to AWQSs/MCLs. In the rinsing schedule this 200 days is approximated by one year. The rinsing

credit for this late rinsing is the remaining two-fifths of the water supply, rinsate extraction pumping, rinsate pumping, and evaporation liability.

Table R3-7: Wellfield Rinsing Credits by Year

| Category | Rate | Unit | Y1 | Y2 | Y3 | Y4 | Y5 | Y6 | Y 7 | Y8 | Y9 | Y10 |
|--------------------------------------|----------------------|----------------|----|----|----|----|-----------|----------|------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Early Rinse cells | | 5-Spot | | | | | 14 | 9 | 8 | 7 | 9 | 8 |
| Pore volume @ 3% porosity per cell | 1.863 | Mgal | | | | | 26.077 | 16.764 | 14.901 | 13.039 | 16.764 | 14.901 |
| Early Rinse volume | 3 pore volumes | Mgal | | | | | 78.231 | 50.292 | 44.704 | 39.116 | 50.292 | 44.704 |
| Water Supply Power Credits | \$268 | \$/Mgal | | | | | \$21,001 | \$13,501 | \$12,001 | \$10,501 | \$13,501 | \$12,001 |
| Rinse Recovery Pumping Power Credits | \$298 | \$/Mgal | | | | | \$23,335 | \$15,001 | \$13,334 | \$11,667 | \$15,001 | \$13,334 |
| Early Rinsate Pumping Credits | \$0 | \$/Mgal | | | | | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Evaporation Power Credits | \$1,127 | \$/Mgal | | | | | \$88,153 | \$56,670 | \$50,373 | \$44,076 | \$56,670 | \$50,373 |
| | Yearly Early | Rinse Credits | | | | | \$132,489 | \$85,172 | \$75,708 | \$66,245 | \$85,172 | \$75,708 |
| Late Rinse Blocks | | block | | | | | | | 14 | 9 | 8 | 7 |
| Pore volume @ 3% porosity per cell | 1.863 | Mgal | | | | | | | 26.077 | 16.764 | 14.901 | 13.039 |
| Late Rinse volume | 2 pore volumes | Mgal | | | | | | | 52.154 | 33.528 | 29.802 | 26.077 |
| Water Supply Power Credits | \$268 | \$/Mgal | | | | | | | \$14,001 | \$9,001 | \$8,001 | \$7,000 |
| Rinse Recovery Pumping Power Credits | \$298 | \$/Mgal | | | | | | | \$15,557 | \$10,001 | \$8,889 | \$7,778 |
| Late Rinsate Pumping Credits | \$0 | \$/Mgal | | | | | | | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Evaporation Power Credits | \$1,127 | \$/Mgal | | | | | | | \$58,769 | \$37,780 | \$33,582 | \$29,384 |
| | Yearly Late | Rinse Credits | | | | | \$0 | \$0 | \$88,326 | \$56,781 | \$50,472 | \$44,163 |
| Tota | l Yearly Wellfield R | insing Credits | | | | | \$132,489 | \$85,172 | \$164,034 | \$123,026 | \$135,644 | \$119,871 |

Rinsing Verification Sampling

Rinsing verification consists of groundwater monitoring of injection/recovery wells after rinsing is completed. The cost was calculated for each year of Stage 1 (Years 1-10) based on the number of injection and recovery wells in existence during that year (Table R3-8). The following assumptions were made:

- Labor costs are based on Clear Creek Associates' Staff 1 billing rate, which is the appropriate staffing level for this task.
- After rinsing of Block 1, 100% of extraction wells (24 wells per Attachment A-1 Section 3.2.8.1) will be sampled for rinse verification. For subsequent blocks, 10% of extraction wells will be monitored for rinse verification, if it can be shown that 10% is representative of the overall groundwater quality within the block (based on the Block 1 results).
- Current pricing from Turner Laboratories in Tucson, AZ was used to calculate analytical laboratory costs.
- No purging is required as the wells will be sampled at the end of rinsing steps so they will already be purged.
- Assumed 1.5 hours of collection time per sample.

Sampling of 10% of the recovery wells is justifiable based on the spacing and number of wells. The entire wellfield is approximately 192 acres. During the life of the project there will be

approximately 1,400 injection/recovery wells operating within the wellfield. Sampling 10% of the wells equates to one well for every 0.73 acres. The dimensions of a 1.4-acre square block are less than 250 feet by 250 feet. Excelsior considers this to be a high sample density that will adequately characterize the effectiveness of rinsing. A sample size of 10% is typically considered statistically significant for quality assurance (QA) verification by ADEQ and other governmental agencies.

Table R3-8: Worksheet used to Calculate Rinsing Verification Unit Costs

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | YEA | R | | | | | | | | | |
|---|-----|----------|--------|----|--------|----|-------|----|-------|------|------|------|------------|------|------------|----|------------|----|-------|------|-------|-------|------|
| | | | | | Y1 | | Y2 | | Y3 | ١ | /4 | ١ | / 5 | | Y6 | | Y7 | | Y8 | | Y9 | Y1 | 10 |
| Description | Qty | Rate | Unit | - | 24 | | 4 | | 5 | | 6 | | 6 | | 6 | | 6 | _ | 6 | | 6 | - | 6 |
| Sample collection (1 hours per sampleno purging required) | 1.5 | | | Ś | 3.420 | Ś | 570 | Ś | 713 | Ś | 855 | Ś | 855 | ć | 855 | \$ | 855 | Ś | 855 | Ś | 855 | _ | 855 |
| Field Parameters Meter (Clear Creek Rate) | 1.3 | \$25.00 | | Ś | 50 | ć | 50 | Ś | 50 | ć | 50 | ć | 50 | ċ | 50 | Ś | 50 | Ś | 50 | خ | 50 | ć | 50 |
| Misc. field costs per well (2) | 1 | \$25.00 | | \$ | 600 | Ś | 100 | \$ | 125 | Ś | 150 | ć | 150 | Ś | 150 | Ś | 150 | خ | 150 | خ | 150 | Ś | 150 |
| Mileage (from Tucson) based on 2 trips per year | 280 | | each | \$ | 154 | Ś | 154 | Ś | 154 | ć | 154 | Ś | 154 | ċ | 154 | Ś | 154 | خ | 154 | Ś | 154 | - | 154 |
| Field Truck (Clear Creek Rate) | 200 | \$95.00 | | \$ | 190 | \$ | 190 | \$ | 190 | Ś | 190 | Ś | 190 | Ś | 190 | Ś | 190 | Ś | 190 | Ś | 190 | | 190 |
| Generator Rental (trailer mounted, from Sunstate Rentals)(3) | 1 | \$713.00 | - | \$ | 713 | \$ | 713 | \$ | 713 | Ś | 713 | Ś | 713 | Ś | 713 | \$ | 713 | Ś | 713 | Ś | 713 | - | 713 |
| Laboratory Costs (TURNER)(1) | 1 | \$715.00 | week | Ş | /13 | Ş | /13 | Ş | /13 | Ş | /13 | ş | /13 | Ş | /13 | Ş | /13 | ۶ | /13 | ۶ | /13 | ۶ | /13 |
| | _ | ć00.00 | | | 4 020 | Ś | 220 | ^ | 400 | Ś | 400 | , | 400 | ć | 400 | _ | 400 | _ | 400 | _ | 400 | | 400 |
| Dissolved Metals ICP (Sb, As, Ba, Be, Cd, Cr, Pb, Se, Th, Ni) | 1 | | sample | \$ | 1,920 | - | 320 | \$ | 400 | \$ | 480 | \$ | 480 | \$ | 480 246 | \$ | 480 246 | \$ | 480 | \$ | 480 | | 480 |
| Mercury dissolved | 1 | | sample | \$ | 984 | \$ | 164 | \$ | 205 | \$ | 246 | \$ | 246 | \$ | | \$ | | \$ | 246 | \$ | 246 | | 246 |
| Fluoride | 1 | | sample | \$ | 480 | \$ | 80 | \$ | 100 | \$ | 120 | Ş | 120 | \$ | 120 | \$ | 120 | \$ | 120 | Ş | 120 | | 120 |
| VOCs | 1 | - | sample | \$ | 3,600 | \$ | 600 | \$ | 750 | \$ | 900 | \$ | 900 | \$ | 900 | \$ | 900 | \$ | 900 | \$ | 900 | | 900 |
| TDS | 1 | _ | sample | \$ | 504 | \$ | 84 | \$ | 105 | \$ | 126 | \$ | 126 | \$ | 126 | \$ | 126 | \$ | 126 | \$ | 126 | \$ | 126 |
| pHfield | 1 | \$0.00 | sample | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| nitrate+nitrite | 1 | \$30.00 | sample | \$ | 720 | \$ | 120 | \$ | 150 | \$ | 180 | \$ | 180 | \$ | 180 | \$ | 180 | \$ | 180 | \$ | 180 | \$ | 180 |
| dissolved U | 1 | \$150.00 | sample | \$ | 3,600 | \$ | 600 | \$ | 750 | \$ | 900 | \$ | 900 | \$ | 900 | \$ | 900 | \$ | 900 | \$ | 900 | \$ | 900 |
| Ra226 + Ra 228 | 1 | \$195.00 | sample | \$ | 4,680 | \$ | 780 | \$ | 975 | \$ 1 | ,170 | \$ 1 | ,170 | \$: | 1,170 | \$ | 1,170 | \$ | 1,170 | \$: | 1,170 | \$ 1, | ,170 |
| gross alpha | 1 | \$85.00 | sample | \$ | 2,040 | \$ | 340 | \$ | 425 | \$ | 510 | \$ | 510 | \$ | 510 | \$ | 510 | \$ | 510 | \$ | 510 | \$ | 510 |
| Data Management, Reporting per sample | 2 | \$95.00 | hr | \$ | 4,560 | \$ | 760 | \$ | 950 | \$ 1 | ,140 | \$ 1 | ,140 | \$: | 1,140 | \$ | 1,140 | \$ | 1,140 | \$: | 1,140 | \$ 1, | ,140 |
| Annual Cost | | | | \$ | 28,215 | \$ | 5,625 | \$ | 6,755 | \$ 7 | ,884 | \$ 7 | ,884 | \$ 7 | 7,884 | \$ | 7,884 | \$ | 7,884 | \$ | 7,884 | \$ 7, | ,884 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Unit Cost per Sample | | | | \$ | 1,176 | \$ | 1,406 | \$ | 1,351 | \$ 1 | ,314 | \$ 1 | ,314 | \$ 1 | 1,314 | \$ | 1,314 | \$ | 1,314 | \$: | 1,314 | \$ 1, | ,314 |
| Notes: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (1) Unit Costs from Turner Laboratories in Tucson, AZ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (2) Ice, disposables, fuel for generator. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (3) weekly unit rate is marked up by 15%. Rate from SunState | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

The annual costs were divided by the number of samples per year to arrive at a unit cost (Table R3-8). The highest unit cost is in Year 1 (\$1,406 per sample in Year 2). This unit cost was used each year to calculate the closure costs for each year.

Well Abandonment Costs

Clear Creek obtained unit costs from three licensed drilling companies in Arizona to compile well abandonment costs. Unit costs (i.e. cost per well to abandon) were calculated for the different types of wells: injection/recovery, hydraulic control, point of compliance, observation, and Intermediate Monitor wells (IMWs). Unit costs for abandonment of each well type are based on the well depth and diameter (volume of grout needed), and whether or not perforation will be required. Injection and recovery wells and hydraulic control wells will be open hole completion so the abandonment costs are relatively low because perforation is not necessary. Observation wells, point of compliance wells and the IMWs with screen and annular materials will be more expensive to abandon because they will require perforation. The average depth of wells in this

portion of the mineralization is expected to be approximately 1,435 feet below land surface, so a depth of 1450 feet was used to calculate the well abandonment costs using third party unit costs provided by Yellow Jacket Drilling, a licensed well driller in Arizona.

Table R3-9 below provides a summary of year-by-year abandonment costs for all wells in existence during each year of Stage 1 operations. Table R3-10 (provided at the end of this text) provides detailed post closure monitoring costs.

Table R3-9: Year-By-Year Well Abandonment Cost Summary

| | We | ellfield | Н | C W | ells | Ob: | s W | /ells | IN | /IWs | R' | VWs | S | |
|------|----------|--------------|----------|-----|---------|----------|-----|---------|----------|------------|----------|-----|---------|-----------------|
| Year | Quantity | Cost | Quantity | | Cost | Quantity | | Cost | Quantity | Cost | Quantity | | Cost | TOTAL |
| Y1 | 38 | \$ 648,660 | 3 | \$ | 30,900 | 2 | \$ | 83,240 | 31 | \$ 329,220 | 0 | \$ | | \$ 1,092,020 |
| Y2 | 58 | \$ 970,660 | 5 | \$ | 51,500 | 4 | \$ | 166,480 | 29 | \$ 307,980 | 0 | \$ | | \$ 1,496,620 |
| Y3 | 78 | \$ 1,249,760 | 5 | \$ | 51,500 | 4 | \$ | 166,480 | 27 | \$ 286,740 | 0 | \$ | - | \$ 1,754,480 |
| Y4 | 95 | \$ 1,562,600 | 6 | \$ | 61,800 | 6 | \$ | 249,720 | 26 | \$ 276,120 | 0 | \$ | | \$ 2,150,240 |
| Y5 | 116 | \$ 1,899,920 | 9 | \$ | 92,700 | 6 | \$ | 250,020 | 26 | \$ 276,120 | 0 | \$ | | \$ 2,518,760 |
| Y6 | 132 | \$ 2,156,240 | 11 | \$ | 113,300 | 8 | \$ | 332,960 | 26 | \$ 276,120 | 0 | \$ | 1 | \$ 2,878,620 |
| Y7 | 150 | \$ 2,445,200 | 19 | \$ | 195,700 | 14 | \$ | 582,380 | 26 | \$ 276,120 | 0 | \$ | | \$ 3,499,400 |
| Y8 | 150 | \$ 2,442,200 | 19 | \$ | 195,700 | 14 | \$ | 582,380 | 25 | \$ 265,500 | 4 | \$ | 64,600 | \$ 3,550,380 |
| Y9 | 148 | \$ 2,410,160 | 19 | \$ | 195,700 | 14 | \$ | 582,380 | 25 | \$ 265,500 | 6 | \$1 | 102,000 | \$ 3,555,740 |
| Y10 | 152 | \$ 2,468,240 | 19 | \$ | 195,700 | 14 | \$ | 582,380 | 23 | \$ 244,260 | 8 | \$1 | 136,000 | \$ 3,626,580 |

Abandonment costs are provided for wells, including injection/recovery wells, observation wells, hydraulic control wells, and the IMWs. NOTE: The POC wells will be installed for the purposes of the APP and the bonding for abandonment will be held by ADEQ.

Assumptions used in calculating abandonment costs are provided at the bottom of the spreadsheet and are linked to the appropriate line items. Some of the key assumptions are:

- 1. Average total depth of wells is 1450 feet.
- 2. Average of 1150 feet of grout will be used to abandon each well to meet ADWR/UIC requirements for the grouted interval.
- 3. Injection/recovery wells will be open hole completion with a 7-inch diameter borehole.
- 4. Hydraulic control wells will be open hole completion with a 5-inch diameter borehole.
- 5. Observation and some of the IMW wells will be constructed with screen and annular materials. Perforation costs are included for these wells.
- 6. One mobilization is included for all wells (excluding the POC wells)
- 7. Consultant labor rates are based on Clear Creek Associates' billing rates, which are consistent with the industry standard in Arizona.

The highest year for well abandonment in Stage 1 is Year 10, with a total cost of approximately 3.63 million.

Post-Closure Monitoring

The post-closure monitoring will comprise 5 years of annual monitoring at three POC wells 8 outer Observation Wells and within the wellfield at Closure Verification Wells (CVWs). The wellfield will be considered closed when five consecutive annual rounds of monitoring at the CVWs outer OWs and the POCs meet AWQSs and MCLs. While this monitoring is scheduled to take place over 5 years at the end of mining, the total cost is included for Years 1 to 10 in the event of premature cessation of operations. Costs for 5 years of post-closure monitoring are estimated to be \$236,548. as shown in Table R3-10:

Table R3-10: Cost for Five Years of Post-Closure Monitoring

| | Quantity | Rate | Unit | markup % | Total | NOTE |
|---|----------|----------|---------|----------------|--------------|---------|
| Sample collection (8 hours per sample, 95 samples) | 760 | \$95.00 | hr | 0 | \$72,200.00 | (2)(3) |
| Field Parameters Meter | 95 | \$25.00 | day | | \$2,375.00 | |
| Misc. field costs5 events | 5 | \$500.00 | lumpsum | | \$2,500.00 | (5) |
| Mileage (from Tucson) (90 days at 140 miles per day) | 12600 | \$0.55 | mile | | \$6,930.00 | (8) |
| Field Truck | 95 | \$95.00 | daily | | \$9,025.00 | |
| Generator Rental (trailer mounted, from Sunstate Rentals) | 15 | \$713.00 | week | 15 | \$12,299.25 | (7) |
| Laboratory Costs | | | | | | |
| Dissolved Metals ICP (Sb, As, Ba, Be, Cd, Cr, Pb, Se, Th, Ni) | 105 | \$80.00 | sample | 15 | \$9,660.00 | (1) (4) |
| Mercury dissolved | 105 | \$41.00 | sample | 15 | \$4,950.75 | (1) (4) |
| Fluoride | 105 | \$20.00 | sample | 15 | \$2,415.00 | (1)(4) |
| VOCs | 105 | \$150.00 | sample | 15 | \$18,112.50 | (1) (4) |
| TDS | 105 | \$21.00 | sample | 15 | \$2,535.75 | (1) (4) |
| pHfield | 105 | \$0.00 | sample | 0 | \$0.00 | (1) (4) |
| nitrate+nitrite | 105 | \$30.00 | sample | 15 | \$3,622.50 | (1) (4) |
| dissolved U | 105 | \$150.00 | sample | 15 | \$18,112.50 | (1) (4) |
| Ra226 + Ra 228 | 105 | \$195.00 | sample | 15 | \$23,546.25 | (1)(4) |
| gross alpha | 105 | \$85.00 | sample | 15 | \$10,263.75 | (1) (4) |
| Data Management, Reporting, 5 annual reports | 400 | \$95.00 | hr | | \$38,000.00 | |
| POC well plugging and abandonment | | | | | | (6) |
| Oversight for well plugging and abandonment (5 POC wells) | | | | | | (6) |
| Post-Closure Costs Total | | | | | \$236,548.25 | |
| NOTES: | | | | Yearly average | \$47,309.65 | |

This is for 5 years post closure monitoring starting at end of Stage 1 (Year 10)

Assumptions

(1)Total of 105 samples will be collected. ((3 POC wells+ 8 Closure Verification Wells+8 outer OWs) x (5 annual events) + (10 Duplicates))= 105 samples

- (2) 95 samples x 8 hours/sample = 440 hours
- (3) Duplicates not included in sampling time
- (4) Unit Costs from Turner Laboratories in Tucson, AZ
- (5) Ice, disposables, fuel for generator.
- (6) Included in well abandonment spreadsheet

Cumulative Closure Liability

The final row in Table R3-1 shows the cumulative wellfield liability with deductions for closure expenses projected to have been accrued to that point on a year-by-year basis. The closure liability for Stage 1 production peaks in Year 10 at \$8.55 million. Without taking credit for scheduled closure items, the maximum closure liability is \$8.67 million, also occurring in Year 10. These closure costs are the same as those provided to the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality (ADEQ) for the Aquifer Protection Permit (APP) except that the APP closure costs also include closure costs for impoundments and POC wells.

References

M3 Engineering & Technology Corp., 2014. Gunnison Copper Project, N143-1 01 Technical Report, Prefeasibility Study, Cochise County, Arizona, USA. February 14, 2014.

December 2016 Attachment R-3 by M-3 Engineering

March, May and July 2017 Revisions by Axelrod, Inc.

| LINE | Closure Costs | Unit | Y1 | Y2 | Y3 | Y4 | Y5 | Y6 | Y7 | Y8 | Y9 | Y10 |
|----------------|---|-----------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|----------------|--------------|----------------|--------------|--------------------------|
| 2 | Mining Block Area | ft ² | 140,000 | 90,000 | 80,000 | 70,000 | 90,000 | 80,000 | 80,000 | 90,000 | 60,000 | 80,000 |
| 3 | Rinsing Volume (5 pore volumes) | Mgal | 130.4 | 83.8 | 74.5 | 65.2 | 83.8 | | | 83.8 | 55.9 | 74.5 |
| 4 | Cumulative Rinsing Volume | Mgal | 130.4 | 214.2 | 288.7 | 353.9 | 359.5 | | 361.4 | 372.5 | 348.3 | 352.0 |
| 5 | Duration of Rinsing @ 400 gpm | days | 249 | 409 | 551 | 676 | 687 | 733 | 690 | 711 | 665 | 672 |
| 6 | Pullback Pumping Volume | Mgal | 513 | 448 | 384 | 319 | 255 | | 255 | 255 | 255 | 255 |
| 7 | | | .1 | . 1 | .1 | .1 | Quar | ntities | .1 | . 1 | | |
| 8 | Prepare Work Plans | lump sum | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 9 | Mobilization | lump sum | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 10 11 | Labor | h | 250 | F0.4 | 700 | 000 | 004 | 4.047 | 000 | 1.010 | 050 | 000 |
| 12 | Project Manager Wellfield Supervisor | hour hour | 356 1,423 | 584 2,338 | 788 3,151 | 966 3,862 | 981 3,923 | 1,047 4,187 | 986 3,943 | 1,016 4,065 | 950 3,801 | 960 3,842 |
| 13 | Wellfield Operators (2) | hour | 2,846 | 4,675 | 6,301 | 7,724 | 7,846 | | | 8,131 | 7,602 | 7,683 |
| 14 | Wellfield Electrician | hour | 1,423 | 2,338 | 3,151 | 3,862 | 3,923 | | 3,943 | 4,065 | 3,801 | 3,842 |
| 15 | Site Security | hour | 2,134 | 3,506 | 4,726 | 5,793 | 5,885 | | 5,915 | 6,098 | 5,702 | 5,763 |
| 16 | | Hour | 2,101 | 0,000 | 1,720 | 0,700 | 0,000 | 0,201 | 0,010 | 0,000 | 0,102 | 0,100 |
| 17 | Changing Pumps | | | | | | _ = | | | _ , | | _ : |
| 18 | Recovery Wells | | 24 | 35 | 47 | 57 | 56 | 53 | 53 | 51 | 51 | 54 |
| 19 | Mobilization | lump sum | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 20 | Service Rig and Crew (2) | hour | 96 | 140 | 188 | 228 | 224 | | 212 | 204 | 204 | 216 27 |
| 21 22 | Per diem | day | 12 | 17.5 | 23.5 | 28.5 | 28 | 26.5 | 26.5 | 25.5 | 25.5 | 21 |
| 23 | Quarterly Reporting | quarter | 3 | 5 | 7 | 8 | 8 | 9 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 |
| 23 24 25 | Volumes for Power Costs | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 26 | Water Supply | Mgal | 130 | 214 | 289 | 354 | 359 | 384 | 361 | 373 | 348 | 352 |
| 27 | Rinse Recovery Pumping | Mgal | 130 | 214 | 289 | 354 | 359 | | 361 | 373 | 348 | 352 |
| 28 | Early Rinsate Pumping | Mgal | 78 | 129 | 173 | 212 | 216 | | 217 | 224 | 209 | 211 |
| 29 | Late Rinsate Pumping | Mgal | 52 | 86 | 115 | 142 | 144 | 153 | 145 | 149 | 139 | 352 352 211 141 |
| 30 | Pullback Pumping | Mgal | 513 | 448 | 384 | 319 | 255 | | 255 | 255 | 255 | 255 |
| 31 | Evaporation Volume Rinsate | Mgal | 130 | 214 | 289 | 354 | 359 | | 361 | 373 | 348 | 255 352 |
| 32 | Evaporation Volume Pullback | Mgal | 513 | 448 | 384 | 319 | 255 | 255 | 255 | 255 | 255 | 255 |
| 33 | Hydraulic Control Pumping (4 yrs) | Mgal | 50 | 56 | 61 | 67 | 73 | 73 | 73 | 73 | 73 | 73 |
| 33 34 35 | Rinsing Verification Sampling | sample | 24 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 |
| 36 | Kinsing Vernication Sampling | Sample | 24 | 4 | 3 | U | 0 | U | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 37 | Pond Closure | | | | - | | | | | | | |
| 38 | Evaporation Pond Closure | each | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 39 | Evaporation Pond Post Closure | each | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 40 | Pipeline Drain Pond Closure | each | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 41 | Pipeline Drain Pond Post Closure | each | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 42 | • | Gaoil | I | <u> </u> | <u> </u> | ı | ! | <u> </u> | I | 1 | | <u> </u> |
| 43 | Well Abandonment | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 44 | Wellfield | each | 38 | 58 | 78 | 95 | 116 | | 150 | 150 | 148 | 152 19 |
| 45 | HC wells | each | 3 | 5 | 5 | 6 | 9 | 11 | 19 | 19 | 19 | 19 |
| 46 | Observation wells | each | 2 | 4 | 4 | 6 | 6 | 8 | 14 | 14 | 14 | 14 |
| 47 | POC wells | each | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 48 | IMW | each | 31 | 29 | 27 | 26 | 26 | 26 | 26 | 25 | 25 | 23 |
| 49 | Rinse Verification wells | each | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 6 | 8 |
| 50 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 51 | Post Closure Monitoring (3 POCs, 8 RVWs, 5 years) | Sample rounds | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| 52 53 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| LINE (| Closure Costs | Unit | Y1 | Y2 | Y3 | Y4 | Y5 | Y6 | Y 7 | Y8 | Y9 | Y10 | |
|----------|---|----------|--------------|-----------------|--------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|--|
| 54 | | | | Estimated Costs | | | | | | | | | |
| 55 | Prepare Work Plans | \$75,000 | \$75,000 | \$75,000 | \$75,000 | \$75,000 | \$75,000 | \$75,000 | \$75,000 | \$75,000 | \$75,000 | \$75,000 | |
| 56 | Mobilization | \$20,000 | \$20,000 | \$20,000 | \$20,000 | \$20,000 | \$20,000 | \$20,000 | \$20,000 | \$20,000 | \$20,000 | \$20,000 | |
| 57 | Labor | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 58 | Project Manager | \$125 | \$44,464 | \$73,048 | \$98,457 | \$120,689 | \$122,594 | \$130,852 | \$123,230 | \$127,041 | \$118,783 | \$120,054 | |
| 59 | Wellfield Supervisor | \$72 | \$102,446 | \$168,304 | \$226,844 | \$278,067 | \$282,457 | \$301,483 | \$283,921 | \$292,702 | \$273,676 | \$276,603 | |
| 60 | Wellfield Operators (2) | \$56 | \$159,360 | \$261,806 | \$352,869 | \$432,549 | \$439,378 | \$468,974 | \$441,655 | \$455,314 | \$425,719 | \$430,272 | |
| 61 | Wellfield Electrician | \$44 | \$62,606 | \$102,852 | \$138,627 | \$169,930 | \$172,613 | \$184,240 | \$173,507 | \$178,873 | \$167,247 | \$169,035 | |
| 62 | Site Security | \$30 | \$64,029 | \$105,190 | \$141,778 | \$173,792 | \$176,536 | \$188,427 | \$177,451 | \$182,939 | \$171,048 | \$172,877 | |
| 63 | Overhead, Vehicles, & Expenses | 10% | \$43,290 | \$71,120 | \$95,857 | \$117,503 | \$119,358 | \$127,398 | \$119,976 | \$123,687 | \$115,647 | \$116,884 | |
| 64 65 | Labor for pullback pumping | \$ | \$1,235,039 | \$1,001,358 | \$793,641 | \$611,889 | \$596,310 | \$528,802 | \$591,117 | \$559,959 | \$627,467 | \$617,082 | |
| 66 | Changing Pumps | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 67 | Capital Cost for pump replacements | \$2,990 | \$71,760 | \$104,650 | \$140,530 | \$170,430 | \$167,440 | \$158,470 | \$158,470 | \$152,490 | \$152,490 | \$161,460 | |
| 68 | Mobilization | \$1,500 | \$1,500 | \$3,000 | \$3,000 | \$3,000 | \$3,000 | \$3,000 | \$3,000 | \$3,000 | \$3,000 | \$3,000 | |
| 69 | Service Rig and Crew (2) | \$180 | \$17,280 | \$25,200 | \$33,840 | \$41,040 | \$40,320 | \$38,160 | \$38,160 | \$36,720 | \$36,720 | \$38,880 | |
| 70 | Per diem | \$350 | \$4,200 | \$6,125 | \$8,225 | \$9,975 | \$9,800 | \$9,275 | \$9,275 | \$8,925 | \$8,925 | \$9,450 | |
| 71 72 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 73 74 | Quarterly Reporting | \$1,620 | \$4,860 | \$8,100 | \$11,340 | \$12,960 | \$12,960 | \$14,580 | \$12,960 | \$12,960 | \$12,960 | \$12,960 | |
| 75 | Rinsing, Pullback, Capital & Power Costs | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 76 | Mechanical Evaporator Capital (9 units) | 91,000 | \$819,000 | \$819,000 | \$819,000 | \$819,000 | \$819,000 | \$819,000 | \$819,000 | \$819,000 | \$819,000 | \$819,000 | |
| 77 | Water Supply Power | \$268 | \$35,002 | \$57,504 | \$77,505 | \$95,006 | \$96,506 | \$103,007 | \$97,006 | \$100,006 | \$93,506 | \$94,506 | |
| 78 | Rinse Recovery Pumping Power | \$298 | \$38,891 | \$63,893 | \$86,117 | \$105,562 | \$107,229 | \$114,452 | \$107,785 | \$111,118 | \$103,896 | \$105,007 | |
| 81 | Pullback Pumping Power | \$72 | \$36,723 | \$32,105 | \$27,486 | \$22,867 | \$18,249 | \$18,249 | \$18,249 | \$18,249 | \$18,249 | \$18,249 | |
| 82 | Evaporation Power | \$1,127 | \$146,922 | \$241,371 | \$325,326 | \$398,787 | \$405,084 | \$432,369 | \$407,183 | \$419,776 | \$392,491 | \$396,688 | |
| 83 | Hydraulic Control Pumping Power (4 yrs) | \$298 | \$14,894 | \$16,579 | \$18,264 | \$19,950 | \$21,635 | \$21,635 | \$21,635 | \$21,635 | \$21,635 | \$21,635 | |
| 84 | Evaporation Power Pullback | \$1,127 | \$578,045 | \$505,345 | \$432,645 | \$359,946 | \$287,246 | \$287,246 | \$287,246 | \$287,246 | \$287,246 | \$287,246 | |
| 85 86 | Rinsing Verification Sampling | \$1,350 | \$32,400 | \$5,400 | \$6,750 | \$8,100 | \$8,100 | \$8,100 | \$8,100 | \$8,100 | \$8,100 | \$8,100 | |
| 87 | | , , | | . , | , , | | . , | , , | . , | . , | . , | , , | |
| 88 89 | Maintenance: Evaporators, Pumps, Rigs | | \$50,000 | \$50,000 | \$50,000 | \$50,000 | \$50,000 | \$50,000 | \$50,000 | \$50,000 | \$50,000 | \$50,000 | |
| 90 | Well Abandonment | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 91 | Wellfield | \$16,448 | \$648,660 | \$970,660 | \$1,249,760 | \$1,562,600 | \$1,899,920 | \$2,156,240 | \$2,445,200 | \$2,442,200 | \$2,410,160 | \$2,468,240 | |
| 92 | HC wells | \$10,300 | \$30,900 | \$51,500 | \$51,500 | \$61,800 | \$92,700 | \$113,300 | \$195,700 | \$195,700 | \$195,700 | \$195,700 | |
| 93 | Observation wells | \$41,620 | \$83,240 | \$166,480 | \$166,480 | \$249,720 | \$249,720 | \$332,960 | \$582,680 | \$582,680 | \$582,680 | \$582,680 | |
| 94 | POC wells (bonded in with ADEQ for APP) | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | |
| 95 | IMW closure | \$10,600 | \$328,600 | \$307,400 | \$286,200 | \$275,600 | \$275,600 | \$275,600 | \$275,600 | \$265,000 | \$265,000 | \$243,800 | |
| 96 | RVW Closure | \$17,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$68,000 | \$102,000 | \$136,000 | |
| 97 | | . , | | , - | | | , - | , - | , | . , | , - | , | |
| 98 | Post Closure Monitoring (3 POCs, 8 RVWs, 5 years) | \$47,310 | \$236,548 | \$236,548 | \$236,548 | \$236,548 | \$236,548 | \$236,548 | \$236,548 | \$236,548 | \$236,548 | \$236,548 | |
| 100 | Subtotal of Closure Liability by Year of Shutdown | | \$4,985,659 | \$5,549,538 | \$5,973,589 | \$6,502,309 | \$6,805,304 | \$7,217,366 | \$7,779,653 | \$7,854,869 | \$7,794,893 | \$7,886,956 | |
| 101 | Contingency for Unanticipated Costs | 10% | \$498,566 | \$554,954 | \$597,359 | \$650,231 | \$680,530 | \$721,737 | \$777,965 | \$785,487 | \$779,489 | \$788,696 | |
| 102 | Closure Liability by Year of Shutdown | | \$5,484,225 | \$6,104,491 | \$6,570,948 | \$7,152,540 | \$7,485,834 | \$7,939,102 | \$8,557,618 | \$8,640,356 | \$8,574,382 | \$8,675,652 | |
| 103 | Less Rinsing Credits | | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | -\$132,489 | -\$85,172 | -\$164,034 | -\$123,026 | -\$135,644 | -\$119,871 | |
| 104 | Net Closure Liability by Year of Shutdown | | \$5,484,225 | \$6,104,491 | \$6,570,948 | \$7,152,540 | \$7,353,345 | \$7,853,930 | \$8,393,584 | \$8,517,331 | \$8,438,738 | \$8,555,781 | |
| 107 | Siedand Elaaming ag i dan di dinatadimi | | ΨΟ, ΤΟ Τ,ΖΖΟ | ψο, το τ, το Γ | ψ3,01 0,0 1 0 | ψ1,102,040 | ψ.,000,040 | ψ.,000,000 | ψ0,000,00 | ψ0,011,001 | ψο, 100,100 | ψ3,000,101 | |

| WELLFIELD INJECTION/RECOVERY WELLS | | | Y1 | | Υ | 2 | Y3 | | ١ ١ | 4 | Y5 | | Y | ′ 6 | Y | 77 | ١ | / 8 | | Y9 | Y10 | |
|---|--------------------|---------|----------|---------|----------|---------------------------------------|----------|-----------|----------|---------------------------------------|-----------|-------------------|----------|-------------------------|----------|-------------------------|----------|--------------|----------|--------------|-----------|-----------|
| Injection Wells in Production | | | \$ | 14 | I | \$ 23 | \$ | 31 | | \$ 38 | \$ | 33 | | \$ 32 | | \$ 32 | | \$ 34 | | \$ 33 | \$ | 33 |
| Recovery Wells in Production | | | \$ | 24 | | \$ 35 | \$ | 47 | | \$ 57 | \$ | 56 | | \$ 53 | | \$ 53 | | \$ 51 | | \$ 51 | \$ | 54 |
| Injection Wells in Rinsing | | | \$ | - | | \$ - | \$ | - | | \$ - | \$ | 14 | | \$ 23 | | \$ 31 | | \$ 24 | | \$ 24 | \$ | 24 |
| Recovery Wells in Rinsing | | | \$ | - | | \$ - | \$ | - | | \$ - | \$ | 13 | | \$ 24 | | \$ 34 | | \$ 36 | | \$ 35 | \$ | 30 |
| Dormant Wells | | | \$ | - | | \$ - | \$ | - | | \$ - | \$ | - | | \$ - | | \$ - | | \$ 5 | | \$ 5 | \$ | 11 |
| Total existing Injection/Recovery Wells | | | \$ | 38 | | \$ 58 | \$ | 78 | | \$ 95 | \$ | 116 | | \$ 132 | | \$ 150 | | \$ 150 | | \$ 148 | \$ | 152 |
| Unit cost | | | Quantity | | Quantity | | Quantity | | Quantity | | Quantity | | Quantity | | Quantity | | Quantity | | Quantity | C | uantity | |
| Mobilization and Demobilization (1) | \$ 10,000.00 lt | ımp sum | 1 \$ | 10,000 | 1 | \$ 10,000 | 1 \$ | 10,000 | 1 | \$ 10,000 | 1 \$ | 10,000 | 1 | \$ 10,000 | 1 | \$ 10,000 | 1 | \$ 10,000 | 1 | \$ 10,000 | 1 \$ | 10,000 |
| ADWR Closure Notification | \$ 150.00 | each | 38 \$ | 5,700 | 58 | \$ 8,700 | 78 \$ | 11,700 | 95 | \$ 14,250 | 116 \$ | 17,400 | 132 | \$ 19,800 | 150 | \$ 22,500 | 150 | \$ 22,500 | 148 | \$ 22,200 | 152 \$ | 22,800 |
| Pump Removal (1) | \$ 1,200.00 | each | 24 \$ | 28,800 | 35 | \$ 42,000 | 47 \$ | 16,800 | 57 | \$ 68,400 | 69 \$ | 82,800 | 77 | \$ 92,400 | 87 | \$ 104,400 | 87 | \$ 104,400 | 86 | \$ 103,200 | 84 \$ | 100,800 |
| Injection Well Port Removal (1) | \$ 600.00 | each | 14 \$ | 8,400 | 23 | \$ 13,800 | 31 \$ | 18,600 | 38 | \$ 22,800 | 47 \$ | 28,200 | 55 | \$ 33,000 | 63 | \$ 37,800 | 58 | \$ 34,800 | 57 | \$ 34,200 | 57 \$ | 34,200 |
| Perforation of Well Casing (2) | \$ 25.00 | ft | 0 \$ | - | 0 | \$ - | 0 \$ | - | 0 | \$ - | 0 \$ | - | 0 | \$ - | 0 | \$ - | 0 | \$ - | 0 | \$ - | 0 \$ | - |
| Abandonment of Boring with Type V Cement (1)(9)(10) | \$ 12.00 | ft | 43700 \$ | 524,400 | 66700 | \$ 800,400 | 89700 \$ | 1,076,400 | 109250 | \$ 1,311,000 | 133400 \$ | 1,600,800 | 151800 | \$ 1,821,600 | 172500 | \$ 2,070,000 | 172500 | \$ 2,070,000 | 170200 | | 174800 \$ | 2,097,600 |
| Removal of casing 2 feet below grade (1) | \$ 150.00 | each | 38 \$ | 5,700 | 58 | \$ 8,700 | 78 \$ | 11,700 | 95 | \$ 14,250 | 116 \$ | 17,400 | 132 | \$ 19,800 | 150 | \$ 22,500 | 150 | \$ 22,500 | 148 | \$ 22,200 | 152 \$ | 22,800 |
| Disposal of Construction Debris (1) (6) | \$ 25,000.00 lt | ımp sum | 1 \$ | 25,000 | 1 | | 1 \$ | 25,000 | 1 | · | 1 \$ | 25,000 | 1 | | 1 | . , | 1 | \$ 25,000 | | \$ 25,000 | 1 \$ | 25,000 |
| Oversight of well abandonments by Consultant (13) | \$ 75.00 | hr | 380 \$ | 28,500 | 580 | | 780 \$ | 58,500 | | | 1160 \$ | 87,000 | 1320 | | 1500 | | 1500 | | 1480 | | 1520 \$ | 114,000 |
| Project management by Consultant (14) | \$ 125.00 | hr | 38 \$ | 4,750 | 58 | | 78 \$ | 5,850 | | | 116 \$ | 8,700 | 132 | | 150 | | 150 | \$ 11,250 | 148 | . , | 152 \$ | 11,400 |
| Per Diem Consultant (15) | \$ 195.00 | each | 38 \$ | 7,410 | 58 | <u> </u> | 78 \$ | 15,210 | 95 | · | 116 \$ | 22,620 | 132 | | 150 | 1 -, | 150 | \$ 29,250 | 148 | -, | 152 \$ | 29,640 |
| | | | \$ | 648,660 | | \$ 970,660 | \$ | 1,249,760 | | \$ 1,562,600 | \$ | 1,899,920 | | \$ 2,156,240 | | \$ 2,445,200 | | \$ 2,442,200 | | \$ 2,410,160 | \$ | 2,468,240 |
| | average cost per w | ell | \$ | 17,070 | | \$ 16,736 | \$ | 16,023 | | \$ 16,448 | \$ | 16,379 | | \$ 16,335 | | \$ 16,301 | | \$ 16,281 | | \$ 16,285 | \$ | 16,238 |
| | | | Y1 | | Υ | 2 | Y3 | | ١ | '4 | Y5 | | Υ | ′ 6 | Y | 77 | | 78 | | Y9 | Y10 | |
| HYDRAULIC CONTROL WELLS | | | 3 | | 5 | | 5 | | 6 | | 9 | | 11 | | 19 | | 19 | | 19 | | 19 | |
| | Unit Cost | | Quantity | | Quantity | | Quantity | | Quantity | | Quantity | | Quantity | | Quantity | | Quantity | | Quantity | C | luantity | |
| Mobilization and Demobilization (3) | \$ 10,000.00 lt | ımp sum | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | | 0 \$ | - | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | |
| ADWR Closure Notification | \$ 150.00 | each | 3 \$ | 450 | 5 | \$ 750 | 5 \$ | 750 | 6 | \$ 900 | 9 \$ | 1,350 | 11 | \$ 1,650 | 19 | \$ 2,850 | 19 | \$ 2,850 | 19 | \$ 2,850 | 19 \$ | 2,850 |
| Pump Removal (1) | \$ 1,200.00 | each | 3 \$ | 3,600 | 5 | \$ 6,000 | 5 \$ | 6,000 | 6 | \$ 7,200 | 9 \$ | 10,800 | 11 | \$ 13,200 | 19 | \$ 22,800 | 19 | \$ 22,800 | 19 | \$ 22,800 | 19 \$ | 22,800 |
| Perforation of Well Casing (2) | \$ 25.00 | ft | 0 \$ | - | 0 | \$ - | 0 \$ | - | 0 | \$ - | 0 \$ | - | 0 | \$ - | 0 | \$ - | 0 | \$ - | 0 | \$ - | 0 \$ | - |
| Abandonment of Boring with Type V Cement (9)(11) | \$ 7.00 | ft | 3450 \$ | 24,150 | 5750 | \$ 40,250 | 5750 \$ | 40,250 | 6900 | \$ 48,300 | 10350 \$ | 72,450 | 12650 | \$ 88,550 | 21850 | \$ 152,950 | 21850 | \$ 152,950 | 21850 | \$ 152,950 | 21850 \$ | 152,950 |
| Removal of casing 2 feet below grade (1) | \$ 150.00 | each | 3 \$ | 450 | 5 | \$ 750 | 5 \$ | 750 | 6 | \$ 900 | 9 \$ | 1,350 | 11 | \$ 1,650 | 19 | \$ 2,850 | 19 | \$ 2,850 | 19 | \$ 2,850 | 19 \$ | 2,850 |
| Disposal of Construction Debris (1) (6) | \$ 25,000.00 lt | ımp sum | \$ | - | | \$ - | \$ | - | | \$ - | \$ | - | | \$ - | | \$ - | | \$ - | | \$ - | \$ | - |
| Oversight of well abandonments by Consultant (13) | \$ 75.00 | hr | 30 \$ | 2,250 | 50 | \$ 3,750 | 50 \$ | 3,750 | 60 | \$ 4,500 | 90 \$ | 6,750 | 110 | \$ 8,250 | 190 | \$ 14,250 | 190 | \$ 14,250 | 190 | \$ 14,250 | 190 \$ | 14,250 |
| Project management by Consultant (14) | \$ 125.00 | hr | 3 \$ | 375 | 5 | \$ 625 | 5 \$ | 625 | 6 | \$ 750 | 9 \$ | 1,125 | 11 | \$ 1,375 | 19 | \$ 2,375 | 19 | \$ 2,375 | 19 | \$ 2,375 | 19 \$ | 2,375 |
| Per Diem Consultant (15) | \$ 195.00 | each | 3 \$ | 585 | 5 | \$ 975 | 5 \$ | 975 | 6 | \$ 1,170 | 9 \$ | 1,755 | 11 | \$ 2,145 | 19 | \$ 3,705 | 19 | \$ 3,705 | 19 | \$ 3,705 | 19 \$ | 3,705 |
| | | | \$ | 30,900 | | \$ 51,500 | \$ | 51,500 | | \$ 61,800 | \$ | 92,700 | | \$ 113,300 | | \$ 195,700 | | \$ 195,700 | | \$ 195,700 | \$ | 195,700 |
| | avg cost per well | | \$ | 10,300 | • | \$ 10,300 | \$ | 10,300 | | \$ 10,300 | \$ | 10,300 | | \$ 10,300 | | \$ 10,300 | • | \$ 10,300 | | \$ 10,300 | \$ | 10,300 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | Y1 | | Υ | '2 | Y3 | | ١ | ' 4 | Y5 | | Υ | ′ 6 | Υ | 77 | ١ | 78 | | Y9 | Y10 | |
| OBSERVATION WELLS | | | 2 | | 4 | | 4 | | 6 | | 6 | | 8 | | 14 | | 14 | | 14 | | 14 | |
| | Unit cost | | Quantity | | Quantity | | Quantity | | Quantity | | Quantity | | Quantity | | Quantity | | Quantity | | Quantity | 0 | Quantity | |
| Mobilization and Demobilization (3) | | ımp sum | 0 \$ | | Quartity | Ċ | Quantity | | Quantity | Ċ . | O ¢ | _ | 0 | ċ . | , | \$ - | Quantity | ¢ . | 0 | | 0 \$ | |
| ADWR Closure Notification | \$ 150.00 | each | 2 \$ | 300 | 4 | Ÿ | 4 \$ | 600 | · | т | 8 \$ | 1,200 | 8 | 7 | 12 | • | 12 | \$ 1,800 | 12 | | 12 \$ | 1,800 |
| Pump Removal (7) | \$ 1,200.00 | each | 0 \$ | 500 | 0 | | 0 \$ | - 000 | 0 | | 0 \$ | - | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | · | 0 | | 0 \$ | |
| Perforation of Well Casing (1) (8) | \$ 25.00 | eacii | 2300 \$ | 57,500 | 4600 | | | 115,000 | | | 6900 \$ | 172,500 | 9200 | | 16100 | • | 16100 | • | _ | • | 16100 \$ | 402,500 |
| | \$ 25.00 | II. | 2300 \$ | 23.000 | 4600 | \$ 115,000 | 4600 \$ | 46.000 | 6900 | | 6900 \$ | 69.000 | 9200 | | 16100 | | 16100 | \$ 402,500 | 16100 | | 16100 \$ | 161,000 |
| Abandonment of Boring with Type V Cement (5)(9)(12) | | | | 300 | 4600 | \$ 40,000 | 4600 \$ | 600 | | | 6 \$ | 900 | 8 | | 10100 | | 10100 | · | 16100 | | | |
| Removal of casing 2 feet below grade (1) | \$ 150.00 | each | | 300 | 4 | \$ 600 | 4 \$ | 000 | 6 | \$ 900 | 0 \$ | 900 | 8 | \$ 1,200 | 14 | \$ 2,100 | 14 | \$ 2,100 | 14 | , , | 14 \$ | 2,100 |
| Disposal of Construction Debris (1) (6) | \$ 25,000.00 lu | ımp sum | \$ | 1 500 | 40 | \$ - | 40.0 | 2.000 | | \$ - | 5 | | 00 | \$ - | 140 | \$ - | 140 | \$ - | 1.10 | \$ - | \$ | 10 500 |
| Oversight of well abandonments by Consultant (13) | \$ 75.00 | hr | | 1,500 | 40 | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | | 3,000 | | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | 60 \$ | 4,500 | 80 | | 140 | | 140 | · | 140 | | 140 \$ | 10,500 |
| Project management by Consultant (14) | \$ 125.00 | hr | 2 \$ | 250 | 4 | | | 500 | | | 6 \$ | 750 | 8 | | 14 | | 14 | , , , , , | 14 | | 14 \$ | 1,750 |
| Per Diem Consultant (15) | \$ 195.00 | each | 2 \$ | 390 | 4 | \$ 780 | 4 \$ | 780 | 6 | , , , | 6 \$ | 1,170 | 8 | 7 -/ | 14 | | 14 | 7 -, | 14 | | 14 \$ | 2,730 |
| | | | \$ | 83,240 | | \$ 166,480 | \$ | 166,480 | | \$ 249,720 | \$ | 250,020 41,670 | | \$ 332,960 \$ 41,620 | | \$ 582,380 \$ 41,599 | | \$ 582,380 | | \$ 582,380 | [\$ | 582,380 |
| | average cost per w | | | 41,620 | | \$ 41,620 | Ċ | 41,620 | | \$ 41,620 | | | | \$ 41.620 | | \$ 41.599 | | \$ 41,599 | | \$ 41,599 | Ś | 41,599 |

| 1 | | | | | | | | | 11 | | | | | | | | | | 1 | |
|---|-------------------|----------|----------|-----------------|----------|-----------|----------|-----------|----------|--------------|----------|-----------------|------------------|----------|--------------|----------|-----------|-------------------|----------|------------|
| Intermediate Monitoring wells(19) | | 31 29 | | 2/ | | 26 | 5 26 | | 26 | | 26 | 26 | | | 25 | 23 | | | | |
| | Unit Cost | | Quantity | Qι | iantity | | Quantity | | Quantity | | Quantity | Q | uantity | Quantity | | Quantity | | Quantity | Quantity | |
| Mobilization and Demobilization (3) | \$ 10,000.00 | | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | \$ - | 0 | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | 0 | |
| ADWR Closure Notification | \$ 150.00 | each | | \$ 4,650 | 29 \$ | 4,350 | 27 \$ | 4,050 | 26 | , | 26 | φ 3,500 | 26 \$ 3,900 | 26 | \$ 3,900 | 25 \$ | 3,750 | 25 \$ 3,750 | 23 \$ | 3,450 |
| Pump Removal (1) | \$ 1,200.00 | each | 31 | \$ 37,200 | 29 \$ | 34,800 | 27 \$ | 32,400 | 26 | \$ 31,200 | 26 | \$ 31,200 | 26 \$ 31,200 | 26 | \$ 31,200 | 25 \$ | 30,000 | 25 \$ 30,000 | 23 \$ | 27,600 |
| Perforation of Well Casing (2) | \$ 25.00 | ft | 0 | \$ - | 0 \$ | - | 0 \$ | - | 0 | \$ - | 0 | \$ - | 0 \$ - | 0 | \$ - | 0 \$ | - | 0 \$ - | 0 \$ | - |
| Abandonment of Boring with Type V Cement (9)(11) | \$ 7.00 | ft | 35650 | \$ 249,550 | 33350 \$ | 233,450 | 31050 \$ | 217,350 | 29900 | \$ 209,300 | 29900 | , | 29900 \$ 209,300 | 29900 | \$ 209,300 | 28750 \$ | 201,250 | 28750 \$ 201,250 | 26450 \$ | 185,150 |
| Removal of casing 2 feet below grade (1) | \$ 150.00 | each | 31 | \$ 4,650 | 29 \$ | 4,350 | 27 \$ | 4,050 | 26 | \$ 3,900 | 26 | \$ 3,900 | 26 \$ 3,900 | 26 | \$ 3,900 | 25 \$ | 3,750 | 25 \$ 3,750 | 23 \$ | 3,450 |
| Disposal of Construction Debris (1) (6) | \$ 25,000.00 | lump sum | | \$ - | \$ | - | \$ | - | | \$ - | | \$ - | \$ - | | \$ - | \$ | - | \$ - | \$ | - |
| Oversight of well abandonments by Consultant (13) | \$ 75.00 | hr | 310 | , -, | 290 \$ | 21,750 | 270 \$ | 20,250 | 260 | , | 260 | | 260 \$ 19,500 | 260 | \$ 19,500 | 250 \$ | 18,750 | 250 \$ 18,750 | 230 \$ | 17,250 |
| Project management by Consultant (14) | \$ 125.00 | hr | 31 | \$ 3,875 | 29 \$ | 3,625 | 27 \$ | 3,375 | 26 | \$ 3,250 | 26 | \$ 3,250 | 26 \$ 3,250 | 26 | \$ 3,250 | 25 \$ | 3,125 | 25 \$ 3,125 | 23 \$ | 2,875 |
| Per Diem Consultant (15) | \$ 195.00 | each | 31 | \$ 6,045 | 29 \$ | 5,655 | 27 \$ | 5,265 | 26 | \$ 5,070 | 26 | \$ 5,070 | 26 \$ 5,070 | 26 | \$ 5,070 | 25 \$ | 4,875 | 25 \$ 4,875 | 23 \$ | 4,485 |
| | | | | \$ 329,220 | \$ | 307,980 | \$ | 286,740 | | \$ 276,120 | | \$ 276,120 | \$ 276,120 | | \$ 276,120 | \$ | 265,500 | \$ 265,500 | \$ | 244,260 |
| | avg cost per well | | | \$ 10,620 | \$ | 10,620 | \$ | 10,620 | | \$ 10,620 | | \$ 10,620 | \$ 10,620 | | \$ 10,620 | \$ | 10,620 | \$ 10,620 | \$ | 10,620 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Rinse Verificaton wells Quantity (Recovery wells | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| left open until end of LOM) (20)(21) | | | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | 0 | | 4 | | 6 | 8 | |
| Cost per well(20) | | | | \$ 17,000 | \$ | 17,000 | \$ | 17,000 | | \$ 17,000 | | \$ 17,000 | \$ 17,000 | | \$ 17,000 | \$ | 17,000 | \$ 17,000 | \$ | 17,000 |
| total liability for RVW abandonment | | | | \$ - | \$ | - | \$ | - | | \$ - | | \$ - | \$ - | | \$ - | \$ | 64,600.00 | \$ 102,000.00 | \$ | 136,000.00 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Abandonment Costs by yearSummary | | | | Y1 | | Y2 | | Y3 | | Y4 | | Y5 | Y6 | | Y7 | | Y8 | Y9 | | Y10 |
| Wellfield | | | | \$ 648,660 | \$ | 970,660 | \$ | 1,249,760 | | \$ 1,562,600 | | \$ 1,899,920 | \$ 2,156,240 | | \$ 2,445,200 | \$ | 2,442,200 | \$ 2,410,160 | \$ | 2,468,240 |
| HC wells | | | | \$ 30,900 | \$ | 51,500 | \$ | 51,500 | | \$ 61,800 | | \$ 92,700 | \$ 113,300 | | \$ 195,700 | \$ | 195,700 | \$ 195,700 | \$ | 195,700 |
| Observation wells | | | | \$ 83,240 | \$ | 166,480 | \$ | 166,480 | | \$ 249,720 | | \$ 250,020 | \$ 332,960 | | \$ 582,380 | \$ | 582,380 | \$ 582,380 | \$ | 582,380 |
| IMW Wells | | | | \$ 329,220 | \$ | 307,980 | \$ | 286,740 | | \$ 276,120 | | \$ 276,120 | \$ 276,120 | | \$ 276,120 | \$ | 265,500 | \$ 265,500 | \$ | 244,260 |
| Rinse Verification Wells/Closure Verification Wells | | | | \$ - | \$ | - | \$ | - | | \$ - | | \$ - | \$ - | | \$ - | \$ | 64,600 | \$ 102,000 | \$ | 136,000 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| TOTAL ABANDONMENT COST-all well types | | • | | \$ 1,092,020 \$ | - \$ | 1,496,620 | \$ - \$ | 1,754,480 | \$ - | \$ 2,150,240 | \$ - | \$ 2,518,760 \$ | \$ 2,878,620 | \$ - | \$ 3,499,400 | \$ - \$ | 3,550,380 | \$ - \$ 3,555,740 | \$ - \$ | 3,626,580 |

NOTEC.

- (1) from Yellow Jacket Drilling quote 7/29/16
- (2) Injection/recovery and Hydrualic control wells will be open hole construction. Casing will be grouted to minimum of 100 feet above bedrock surface. If a well is screened (with no annular materials), the screen will be removed prior to grouting. No perforation will be necessary for injection/recovery and hydraulic control wells.
- (3) Single mobilization/demobilization cost applies to all well types. The cost is Included in Injection/recovery well abandonment mob/demob
- (4) Most HC wells will be open hole construction, and casing will be grouted to minimum of 100 feet above bedrock surface. If a well is screened, the screen will be removed prior to grouting. There will be no annular materials in these wells. No perforation will be necessary.
- (5) It is assumed that annular materials have a porosity of 35% for grout volume calculations.
- (6) Single lump sum for all wells is included under the injection/recovery well costs.
- (7) Observation wells are piezometers and will not be equipped with pumps
- (8) POC and Observation wells will be installed with screen and annular materials. Perforations (2 per foot) are required under ADWR's standard abandonment method. Cost assumes average 1150 feet of perforation per well, which will bring peforations well above the historical water levels, as required by the
- (9) assumes average well depth of 1450 feet, average 1150 feet of grout
- (10) assumes 7-inch open borehole, per Yellow Jacket quote per foot cost of \$12
- (11) assumes 5-inch open borehole, pro-rated abandonment cost of \$7 per foot per conversation with Yellow Jacket.
- (12) assumes 4-inch diameter well in 9 inch diameter borehole, 35% annular materials porosity, pro-rated cost of \$10 per foot, per conversation with Yellow Jacket.
- (13) assumes 10 hours of oversight per well, using Clear Creek Technician I rate for this task.
- (14) assumes 1 hour of project management per well. Includes documentation and reporting of well abandonment.
- (15) assumes \$195 per well which includes perdiem (\$100) and truck rental (\$95)
- (16) Perforation only in low carbon steel casing (16 NSH wells), to a minimum of 20 feet above static water level. Total footage was compiled from as-built drawings for each well.
- (17) There are 16 wells with LCS casing and screen. Assumes 4-inch diameter well in 10 inch diameter borehole, 35% annular materials porosity, pro-rated cost of \$12 per foot.
- (18) 31 IMWs are planned for years 1-15 of operation. IMWs will be plugged and abandoned when their location is in an active mining block. In year 1 there will be 31 IMWs. By year 10, eight IMWs will have been abandoned, leaving 23.
- (19) RVWs were previously used as recovery wells. Cost to abandon is same as recovery well. Approximately 10% wellfield injection recovery wells from year 1...
- (20) Closure verification wells are a subset of the RVWs. So no additional costs for closure of CVWs. They are included in the RVW closure costs.